

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 6 and 23-33 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been cancelled from the application without prejudice. Claims 3-4, 6, 23-24 and 32 have been amended to more clearly set forth what it is that the Applicant's regard as their invention. Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 33 and claims 2-4 and 6 have been amended to depend upon new claim 33. Moreover, the specification has been amended to comply with the Examiner's requirement for a compact disc submission listing in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(e).

No new matter has been added to the application by way of these specification or claim amendments.

I. COMPACT DISC SUBMISSION

The Examiner objected to improper description in the specification of the contents of the previously submitted compact disc.

This objection has been overcome by canceling the "Computer Program Listing" from the specification and replacing it with a description that complies with 37 CFR 1.52(e).

II. THE SECTION 112, 2nd PARAGRAPH CLAIM REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, and 23-32 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph for being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner believes that the recitation of the conduits, chambers and their structural cooperation in the claims is indefinite.

This rejection has been overcome by amending claim 23 above to clearly recite the elements of the claimed invention and their structural relationship. Similar amendments were

included in new claim 33 – which is claim 5 rewritten in independent form. The rejection of claim 1 on these grounds has been mooted by the cancellation of claim 1 from the application.

III. THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS

The Examiner's obviousness rejection of claims 1-2 has been mooted by canceling claim 1 from the application without prejudice and by amending claim 2 to be dependant upon claim 33.

IV. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner indicted that claims 23-32 would be allowable if amended to overcome the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection. Claim 23 has been amended above in a manner that overcomes the rejection, therefore, claims 23-32 are believed to be currently patentable.

The Examiner indicated that claims 5-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form and is presented as new claim 33. The dependency of claim 6 and claims 2-4 have been altered to depend upon new claim 33. Claims 33 and 2-4 and 6 are, therefore, believed to be patentable as a result of these amendments.

V. STATUS OF CLAIMS 3-4

The Examiner did not indicate the status of claims 3-4 in the final rejection other than to indicate that they stood rejected under 112, 2nd paragraph. Since the Section 112 rejection has been overcome in this Reply, claims 3-4 are now believed to be independently patentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that presently pending claims 2-4, 6 and 23-33 are patentable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all pending application claims is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff

Dated: September 26, 2003

By: 

A. Blair Hughes
Reg. No. 32,901
(312) 913-2123